

Voluntary Access to Quality Preschools For all Four Year Olds:

A component of Iowa's Strong Start Initiative

Legislative Advocacy
State Board of Education

State Board Position Statement

Improve voluntary access to quality preschool programming for four-year-olds statewide.

Overview

Research increasingly shows the importance of quality early learning environments in a child's development. This proposal establishes a predictable, equitable, and sustainable funding method that expands voluntary access to quality programs for children who are four years old. The proposal establishes a funding method similar to the current method used to fund school districts. The funding enables districts to ensure appropriately licensed early childhood teachers are available to provide early learning experiences in various preschool settings and provide funds for the administrative support needed to establish quality programs and coordinate with community based programs and services.

Background/Talking Points

For the past eleven years, the State Board's leadership and legislative agenda have advocated for early childhood efforts. The Governor recently reinforced this emphasis through the recommendations of the lowa Learns Council and through expanded early care supports enacted during the 2005 legislative session. Positive momentum on preschool supports must be maintained if lowa intends to sustain its quality educational system.

Talking Points:

- lowa is struggling to keep pace with other states in its response to the evidence of positive developmental effects created by the implementation of a quality preschool system. For a state that prides itself on its quality education system, the lack of systemic approach to the implementation of a quality preschool system is of great concern. Iowa's current system consists primarily of targeted programs for qualifying families meeting an income eligibility criterion or children with disabilities. However, research has shown that all children can benefit from access to quality preschool programming. The research also shows that poor quality preschool experiences can actually inhibit the cognitive and social development of children.
- Dollars dedicated to early learning opportunities are lowa's best and most cost-effective long-term investment in reducing future costs for academic

Gene E. Vincent President Carroll

Sally J. Frudden Vice President Charles City

Charles C. Edwards, Jr. Des Moines

Sister Jude Fitzpatrick Davenport

Wayne Kobberdahl Council Bluffs

> Rosie Hussey Mason City

Gregory D. McClain Cedar Falls

Mary Jean Montgomery Spencer

> Max Phillips Woodward

Tara Richards Student Member Indianola

Judy Jeffrey Director and Executive Officer

- remediation, in building a quality workforce, and in supporting the quality of family life that lowa values. Access to quality preschool should never be completely dependent on the ability of a parent to pay.
- Investing in quality preschool programs results in children ready to succeed in school.
 Similar investments by other states have resulted in a decrease in the numbers of students served by special education in later school years.
- Investing in children at an early age reduces achievement gaps and provides citizens that contribute to our workforce. Expanding quality preschool benefits all children by improving the overall early elementary environment. It reduces the time that teachers need to spend helping some students adjust socially and academically and enables teachers to spend more time teaching and less time on social management.
- The development of early learning standards (skills young children should have), preschool program standards (the quality of preschool programs for three- and four-year-olds), and a childcare rating system (the quality of child care programs for birth- to school age) are necessary components of a quality early childhood system.
- Nationally in 2004, 85% of all 4-year-olds and 3% of all three-year-olds were enrolled in state-funded preschool programs. Currently, approximately 19 % of lowa three- and four-year-olds have access to quality preschool. This number should be 100%.
- 77% of lowa families with children under the age of six have both or the only parent(s) working ranking lowa fourth in the country.
- Preschool has the largest impact on the children who need it the most minority, English Language Learners (ELL), and low-income children. Providing quality preschool services to these children will assist in reducing the achievement gaps later in school. For example, data from Head Start programs show the long-term effect of narrowing achievement gaps for at-risk students. Children's participation in a quality preschool has also been demonstrated to decrease the frequency of crime and the need for correctional facility placements later in life.

Key components of draft legislation

- This effort is intended to build on the existing preschool system. Preschool supports provided through Shared Visions, Head Start, Empowerment, Title I, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), non-profit and for-profit providers, faith-based and private providers, and parent-fee supported systems are needed and necessary components to this system of statewide supports.
- Funding should create a stable source of revenue rather than dependency on yearly appropriations to support program quality and continuity.
- Funding is provided through the school aid formula, which flows directly to public school districts with a proposed 0.6 weighting for 4-year-olds. The 2006-07 available formula funding for services for children in these programs would be: the number of 4-year-old children in a preschool program in 2006 X \$5128 X 0.6.
- \$15 million dollars would expand preschool access by approximately 4800 slots in 2006-07. It will cost approximately \$75 million per year after five years to fully implement this system at a rate of 90% participation. This dollar amount was determined after backing out federal and state supports already provided through IDEA, Title I, Head Start, Empowerment, and Shared Visions. In other words, these programs would continue to support all eligible children, while this new initiative would expand on those existing programs to enable more non-targeted children access to quality preschool.
- The funding enables districts to employ appropriately licensed teachers to provide early learning experiences in various preschool settings, whether in school district buildings, private community preschools or licensed childcare, Heat Start programs or Shared

Visions centers. The licensed teacher would be responsible for designing and implementing effective learning environments using instructional strategies that enhance children's learning. The teacher would also be available to continue the work to build effective relationships with parents to enhance the early learning experience.

- Funding is only provided when the school district has determined that parents voluntarily choose to send their child to preschool.
- School districts must also demonstrate the readiness of the community to support a quality preschool program.
- School districts would be obligated to work with other licensed childcare or preschool programs wanting to provide a quality preschool program for four-year-old children.
- If a community already provides adequate openings for preschool children, then community partners should work together to determine if current programs meet quality standards and have a licensed early childhood teacher to maintain standards.
- Once agreements are reached with community providers, contracts could be implemented with preschool providers for the school district to hire or contract with a licensed teacher to provide a quality program at least 10 hours per a week. The private preschool programs would continue to offer the wrap around or existing services for the rest of the day not covered by the instruction provided through these resources.
- A school district could also offer a preschool program for 4 year olds this could occur if all families wanting to have their children in preschool programs do not have access in or near the community. It could also happen if private preschools do not wish to participate by having an appropriately licensed early childhood teacher and meeting these standards.
- The licensed preschool teacher would be employed by a school district and would work very closely with community empowerment efforts, especially the need for wrap-around childcare for children and their families, professional development, parent support/education and other services for children.

Possible Scenarios

Urban setting: A large metro area has multiple preschool and childcare systems, including Head Start, Shared Visions, Early Childhood Special Education programs, Title I supports, faith-based preschools and childcare, and for-profit and private child care. The school district creates an opportunity for all stakeholders, including providers, community members, the local Empowerment Board and others, to collaborate in developing a plan for the delivery of consistent programming geared toward the implementation of quality program standards and early learning standards. This collaboration includes multiple ways of delivering the minimum hours of instruction including the employed licensed early childhood teachers going to settings already serving groups of four year olds in faith-based preschools and childcare and for-profit and faith-based child care.

In some cases, the school district uses buildings with available space to create new centers. As much as possible, family needs are addressed by keeping the service in the current center serving the child. If needed, funds from existing programs can be used together to create classrooms that serve as a single service provider, yet are supported by multiple funding sources. The collaboration elects to advertise access to this programming citywide. The ads invite parents and non-licensed providers to bring their four-year-olds to any center providing this service where participation for those children would be free. The school district coordinates the employment of licensed early childhood teachers and provides oversight of the delivery of programming provided by this funding. Access is expanded 30% in the first year, accommodating many of the families on waiting lists with other programs as well as creating new opportunities for other four year olds who do not qualify for the current targeted services.

Programs are provided in an integrated way so there is less segregation by income or disability. The district is the fiscal agent for the collaboration and handles budgeting and accountability for the programming.

Remote rural settings: No preschool is available for a 30-mile radius. The only childcare providers are non-licensed or registered child development home providers. The school district distributes a community needs assessment survey and holds a community meeting inviting parents and community members to discuss possible ways to create a program for four year olds in the 30-mile radius. The results from the survey indicated that the home providers are at maximum capacity and have waiting lists. It was reported that when home providers are ill or unavailable, parents have no other childcare option. The input from the community centered on a recently abandoned business on the edge of town that could be remodeled as a childcare center. The community sees enough interest in this program to create a nonprofit childcare center. The school district collaborates with the center to provide a licensed early childhood teacher for a minimum of 10 hours per week at no cost to the center. Because a Head Start program is available in the county, but only at a center more than 30 miles away, this classroom also provides preschool services for five local Head Start children. Wrap-around childcare is provided for parents with children needing full-day childcare. Many of the home providers have collaborated with the childcare center in order to reduce the number of children that are on their waiting lists and meet the needs of working parents.

Moderately small town: The school district is interested in participation in this program. The only providers of service to four year olds are the school (Early Childhood Special Education), the local Catholic Church (preschool and childcare), and a limited number of registered and non-registered childcare providers. Because the church has limited space, the collaboration decides to use space in the school building for the programming. The school picks up four-year-olds from the preschool at the church to bring to the school site for 10 hours of instruction per week. The district provides an integrated program by serving the children with and without disabilities together in this preschool program. The district is able to address the IDEA requirement of serving children in special education in the least restrictive environment.

Research Support/Additional Resources

A new economic impact study recently released findings that the investment in quality early childhood programs serving 4-year-old children saves districts and society money by showing significant cost benefits. According to the study of the Wisconsin 4-K programs, for every \$1 put into preparing 4-year-olds for learning, the Wisconsin schools would save 68 cents on the dollar in later costs such as special education and teacher turnover ("In How 4-year-old Kindergarten Pays," *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, 2005). Early education is seen as a form of economic development, and the "most practical and cost efficient way" of making an economic impact may be on providing access for all children (quote from W. Steven Barnett, director of the National Institute for Early Education Research, at Rutgers University).

Young children exposed to high-quality settings exhibit better language and math skills, better cognitive and social skills and better relationships with classmates than do children in lower-quality care. Evaluations of well-run early-learning programs have also found that children in those environments were less likely to drop out of school, repeat grades, need special education, or get into future trouble with the law than similar children who did not have such exposure ("In Early-childhood Education and Care: Quality Counts," *Education Week – Building Blocks for Success*, 2002). Environments that support the stimulation and nurturing of children play a crucial role in developing the full capacity of a child to learn. Research has shown that

certain program standards such as adult-child ratio, group size and teacher education level are associated with better early learning opportunities and promote the conditions that support early development and learning ("In Child Care Quality: Does it Matter and Does it Need to be Improved?" Office of ASPE, US Department of Health and Human Services, 2000). Many studies confirm that one of the most crucial variables leading to quality preschool programs is teacher education and training. The funds that are generated using the proposed funding formula will generate resources to ensure that highly qualified, licensed early childhood teachers are providing high quality preschool experiences.

In December 2005, The National Institute of Early Education Research (NIEER) published the results of a study on school readiness (Barnett, Lamy, & Jung, 2005) conducted in a broad cross-section of preschool programming nationally. The research found significant and meaningful effects on children's language, literacy, and math skills. This study provides evidence that quality preschool programs produce broad gains in children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.

Research also indicates that the impact is long lasting. A follow-up study of the High Scope Foundation's Perry Preschool showed that at age 40, the Perry Preschool cohort demonstrated remarkable differences from the control group in educational attainment, home ownership, arrests and incarceration, and employment ("The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study through Age 40, High/Scope Press, Ypsilanti, MI, 2006). A second evaluation study involving the Chicago Child-Parent Center Program showed that when its preschoolers turned 21, the assessment revealed results similar to the Perry Preschool study. In addition to providing evidence of the effectiveness of the programs, both studies also pointed out that a dollar invested in preschool saved the taxpayer \$7 in cost for later services such as jails and drug detoxification centers ("Leaving Too Many Children Behind," *Institute for Educational Leadership*, April 2003).

These additional resources describe the potential positive benefits of a statewide quality system of preschool supports:

- lowa Learns Council Recommendations: http://www.state.ia.us/iowalearns/reports.html
- A positive economic analysis of the Wisconsin Early Childhood Effort: http://www.preknow.org/documents/WIEconImpactReport Sept2005.pdf
- A variety of resources describing the Wisconsin Early Childhood Effort: http://dpi.wi.gov/ec/ec4yrpag.html
- Pre(K)Now Legislative Report 2005 marking the latest progress nationally on preschool/prekindergarten efforts: http://www.preknow.org/documents/LegislativeReport Nov2005.pdf.
- California's current effort to enact universal preschool: http://action.preschoolcalifornia.org/initiative/
- Research describing the long-term effects of the Perry Preschool Project at age 40: http://www.highscope.org/Research/PerryProject/PerryAge40SumWeb.pdf.
- The [Positive] Effects of State Prekindergarten Programs on Young Children's School Readiness in Five States: MI, NJ, OK, SC, WV: http://nieer.org/docs/index.php?DocID=129.
- The Child and Family Policy Center research: http://www.cfpciowa.org/.
- The National Institute for Early Education Research a wealth of studies: http://nieer.org/.
- The National Association of Elementary School Principals Early Childhood research: http://www.naesp.org/ContentLoad.do?contentId=49.
- Georgia SmartStart Early Childhood Initiative: http://www.smartstartga.org/home.php.

- Rand Corporation on positive effects of early childhood interventions: http://www.rand.org/publications/RB/RB5014/index.html.
- NCEDL multi-state study of the costs, quality, and outcomes for investment in preschool: http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~NCEDL/pages/cq.cfm
- ChildTrends research on preschools: http://www.childtrends.org/.
- The Iowa Head Start Annual Report 2004: www.iowaheadstart.org.
- The Shared Visions Annual Report 2004: http://www.state.ia.us/educate/ecese/is/cdcc/documents.html.
- The lowa Community Empowerment web site: http://www.empowerment.state.ia.us/.

Data Support

Summaries of available data describing current state and future projections including potential costs

- There are an estimated 36,379 4-year-olds in Iowa during the 2005-06 school year. Projected numbers of 4-year-olds by future years: 2006-07 –36,724; 2007-08 –36,708; 2008-09 –36,643.
- 95.6% of all school districts offered all-day, every-day kindergarten in 2004-05.
- 230 of 367 or 62.7 percent of school districts in 2004-05 offered preschool programs serving 10,899 students. Thirty percent of these students were in school districts of 7,500 students or larger.
- PreK-12 enrollments show tremendous growth in certain race/ethnic groups that are typically highly served by existing preschool programming. Between 1985-86 and 2004-05, the following growth in subpopulations was noted: Hispanic 529%, American Indian 160%, English Language Learners 146%, African American 88%, Asian 69%,
- Schools are also supporting childcare programs before/after school, and in the summer. In the 2004-05 school year, 104 school districts offer before school child care, 135 offer after school child care and 85 school districts offer childcare in the summer.
- Approximately 19% of 3- and 4-year-old children in Iowa are currently served by quality preschools. (Quality is defined as those preschool programs that meet NAEYC or Head Start program performance standards).
- Iowa's Condition of Education Annual Report and statewide Profile of Schools: http://www.state.ia.us/educate/fis/pre/coer/index.html.
- Kids Count Data Book: http://www.aecf.org/kidscount/sld/databook.jsp.
- The National Institute for Early Education Research: http://nieer.org/.

Response to the Critics: Questions and Answers

Note: The National Institute for Early Education Research has an excellent general Question and Answer page that addresses many of the lowa-specific issues below from a national perspective (http://nieer.org/fag/).

Question 1: Other industrialized countries like China and Japan are outperforming us on indicators such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and do not support any type of preschool programming. Why should lowa make this investment in light of that information?

Answer: The evidence in the United States indicates that quality preschool programs improve academic achievement. Different societies place different value on school performance and preparation and the system structures to support student development. Because of these societal differences, any comparison must account for all of the differences between countries

and educational support systems. Many high-performing industrialized countries are investing heavily in preschool supports (e.g., France, Sweden, Denmark, Norway).

Question 2: Where will lowa find the money for this?

Answer: The per-pupil portion of this programming is provided from the state's general fund. This is an investment intended to save money in the long-term. Many of the research articles referenced in the document show the cost of not providing quality preschool to be potentially far greater than this investment. Results from the follow-up study of the High Scope Foundation's Perry Preschool showed the following participant results forty years later: 1) More of the high-quality early education group graduated from high school than the non-program group (65% vs. 45%); 2) More were employed at age 40 (76% vs. 62%); 3) Program participants had median annual earnings more than \$5,000 higher than the non-program group (\$20,800 vs. \$15,300); 4) More program participants owned their own homes and had a savings account than the non-program group (76% vs. 50%); 5) They had significantly fewer arrests than the non-program group (36% vs. 55% arrested five times or more); and 6) They had significantly fewer members of the group arrested for violent crimes (32% vs. 48%), property crimes (36% vs. 58%), or drug crimes (14% vs. 34%). These researchers indicate that for every dollar invested taxpayers saved \$13.

Question 3: Won't this put private preschool providers out of business?

Answer: Private providers of preschool services are an important part of the equation to reach the goal of providing universal access to quality preschool for all four-year-olds. Local school districts may no be able to provide the needed services and supports to sustain a successful preschool. They may need other providers to make this initiative successful. This effort is likely to expand private provider opportunities and availability. Existing resources available to private providers will stretch farther with the infusion of resources from this effort. The overall purpose to this proposal is to provide more funding into preschool programming that is predictable, equitable, and sustainable and this equation includes private providers.

Question 4: If brain development occurs best at earlier ages, why not address birth to three populations first?

Answer: Iowa's Strong Start Initiative is designed to help all Iowa children be ready for school by requiring a strong and nurturing care system for children birth to three and high quality preschool experiences for children three to five. The first proposal involves additional supports for birth to three services and the access to four-year-old preschool proposal covers preschool supports. Together they represent a "strong start" to create the kind of early childhood comprehensive support services Iowa needs to help school readiness, including interventions at younger ages when the brain is developing most rapidly.

Question 5: Why not just expand the Shared Visions program under the Department of Education?

Answer: It is clear that children attending Shared Visions preschools benefit from participation in those programs. Shared Visions programs are known for the high quality supports they provide. This is why the Department is seeking level funding for Shared Visions programming this year. However, the Department recognizes that the early care and preschool system in lowa is comprised of many parts and that any system of preschool supports for 4 year olds must be flexible. The resources provided by this initiative are intended to enhance the access to high

quality preschool for four-year-olds statewide and patience will be required while we work to expand access and increase quality across the system.

Question 6: Why not just expand preschool efforts through Empowerment Areas?

Answer: In a separate service offer from the Department of Management, community empowerment is seeking funding to support current efforts and expand technical assistance to communities. This collaborative offer, along with the support for four-year-old preschool, is all a part of lowa's Strong Start, a comprehensive effort at enhancing supports for children birth to five. This proposal provides a funding stream that is exclusively dedicated to preschool. There are a couple of considerations when seeking to expand preschool supports through Empowerment. First, Empowerment areas can address any birth to five issue including health, family supports, & childcare issues. Limiting the use of funding for Empowerment Boards changes their mission and limits their flexibility in addressing needs of children in areas other than preschool. Second, flowing the money for this initiative through school districts provides a more consistent vehicle for a more stable funding stream.

Question 7: Why not just give parents the funding – wouldn't this expand access?

Answer: This certainly could work to expand access, but the effort proposed by the Department for four-year-old preschools is seeking to also improve the quality of the statewide system. Dollars given directly to parents would do little to enhance the quality of the system overall. As research in other states indicates, poor quality preschool experiences not only are unable in some cases to help children be ready for kindergarten; they can actually have a detrimental effect on cognitive and social development.

Important Legislative and Governmental Stakeholders

House of Representatives Leaders

Rep. Christopher Rants, R (54 – Sioux City) Speaker of the House

christopher.rants@legis.state.ia.us

Rep. Pat Murphy, D (28 – Dubuque) Minority Leader

patrick.murphy@legis.state.ia.us

Rep. Chuck Gipp, R (16 – Decorah) Majority Leader

charles.gipp@legis.state.ia.us

Rep. Scott Raecker, R (63 – Urbandale) Chair – Appropriations

scott.raecker@legis.state.ia.us

Rep. Mark Kuhn, D (14 – Charles City) Ranking Member – Appropriations

mark.kuhn@legis.state.ia.us

House of Representatives Committee Leaders

Rep. Jodi Tymeson, R (73 - Winterset) Chair, Education Committee

iodi.tvmeson@legis.state.ia.us

Rep. Linda Upmeyer, R (12 - Garner) Chair, Human Resources Committee

linda.upmeyer@legis.state.ia.us

Rep. Roger Wendt, D (2 - Sioux City)

Ranking Member, Education Committee

roger.wendt@legis.state.ia.us

Rep. Mark Smith, D (43 – Marshalltown) Ranking Member, Human Resources Committee

mark.smith@legis.state.ia.us

Rep. Jeff Kaufmann, R (79 – Wilton) Vice Chair, Education Committee

jeff.kaufmann@legis.state.ia.us

Rep. Paul Wilderdyke, R (56 – Woodbine) Vice Chair, Human Resources Committee

paul.wilderdyke@legis.state.ia.us

Rep. Royd Chambers, R (5 – Sheldon) Chair – Education Approps. Subcommittee

royd.chambers@legis.state.ia.us

Rep. Dave Heaton, R (91 – Mt. Pleasant) Chair – Health/Human Resources Approps Sub.

david.heaton@legis.state.ia.us

Rep. Ro Foege, D (29 – Mount Vernon) Ranking Mem, Health/Human Res. Approps. Sub.

ro.foege@legis.state.ia.us

Rep. Jo Oldson, D (61 – Des Moines) Ranking Member, Education Approps. Sub.

joanne.oldson@legis.state.ia.us

Other key House legislators on this topic: Rep. Janet Petersen, D (64 – Des Moines); Rep. Rod Roberts, R (51 – Carroll); Rep. Lisa Heddens, D (46 – Ames).

General House Phone Number: 515-281-3221 (During session, use this number to be transferred to a Representative's desk.)

Caucus Staff Members: Ann McCarthy, R Education Committee and Approps Sub.

ann.mccarthy@legis.state.ia.us

Brad Trow, R Human Resources Committee and Approps.

brad.trow@legis.state.ia.us

Joe Romano, D Education Committee and Approps Sub

joe.romano@legis.state.ia.us

Ed Conlow, D Human Resources Committee and Approps.

ed.conlow@legis.state.ia.us

House Education Committee: http://www3.legis.state.ia.us/ga/committee.do?id=21

House Human Resources Committee: http://www3.legis.state.ia.us/ga/committee.do?id=24

Education Approps Sub: http://www3.legis.state.ia.us/ga/committee.do?id=35

Health and Human Resources Approps Sub:

http://www3.legis.state.ia.us/ga/committee.do?id=37

Senate Leadership

Sen. Jeff Lamberti, R (35 – Ankeny) Co-President

jeffrey.lamberti@legis.state.ia.us

Sen. Jack Kibbie, D (4 – Emmetsburg) Co-President

john.kibbie@legis.state.ia.us

Sen. Stewart Iverson, R (5 – Dows) R Floor Leader

stewart.lverson@legis.state.ia.us

Sen. Mike Gronstal, D (50 – Council Bluffs) D Floor Leader

michael.gronstal@legis.state.ia.us

Sen. Jeff Angelo, R (48 – Creston) Co-Chair, Appropriations

jeff.angelo@legis.state.ia.us

Sen. Bob Dvorsky, D (15 – Iowa City) Co-Chair, Appropriations

robert.dvorsky@legis.state.ia.us

Senate Committee Leadership

Sen. Paul McKinley, R (36 – Chariton) Co-Chair, Education Committee

paul.mckinley@legis.state.ia.us

Sen. Mike Connolly, D (14 – Dubuque)

Co-Chair, Education Committee

michael.connolly@legis.state.ia.us

Sen. James Seymour, R (28 – Woodbine) Co-Chair, Human Resources Committee

james.seymour@legis.state.ia.us

Sen. Amanda Ragan, D (7 – Mason City) Co-Chair, Human Resources Committee

> amanda.ragan@legis.state.ia.us Co-Chair, Education Approps, Sub.

Sen. Nancy Boettger, R (29 – Carroll) nancy.boettger@legis.state.ia.us

Co-Chair, Education Approps. Sub.

Sen. Wally Horn, D (17 – Cedar Rapids) wally.horn@legis.state.ia.us

Sen. Maggie Tinsman, R (41 – Davenport) Co-Chair, Health/Human Res. Approps Sub.

maggie.tinsman@legis.state.ia.us

Sen. Jack Hatch, D (33 – Des Moines) Co-Chair, Health/Human Res. Approps Sub.

jack.hatch@legis.state.ia.us

Other key Senate legislators on this topic: Sen. Frank Wood, D (42 – Eldgridge); Sen. Dave Mulder, R (2 – Sioux Center).

General Senate Phone Number: 515-281-3371 (During session, use this number to be transferred to a Senator's desk.)

Caucus Staff Members: Angie Lewis, R **Education Committee**

angie.lewis@legis.state.ia.us

Peter Matthes. R **Human Resources Committee**

peter.matthes@legis.state.ia.us

Bridget Godes, D **Education Committee**

bridget.godes@legis.state.ia.us

Dick Oshlo, D Human Resources Committee and Approps

dick.oshlo@legis.state.ia.us

Carolann Jensen, R Appropriations carolann.jensen@legis.state.ia.us Theresa Kehoe, D Ed. Approps theresa.kehoe@legis.state.ia.us

Senate Education Committee: http://www3.legis.state.ia.us/ga/committee.do?id=5

Senate Human Resources Committee: http://www3.legis.state.ia.us/ga/committee.do?id=7

Education Approps Sub: http://www3.legis.state.ia.us/ga/committee.do?id=35

Health and Human Resources Approps Sub:

http://www3.legis.state.ia.us/ga/committee.do?id=37

Groups with which you should advocate on this issue

Farm Bureau Representatives Chambers of Commerce Rotary Clubs Lion's Clubs PTAs/PTOs

Local newspaper editors

Child Care Center administrators and board members

Local Empowerment Boards

Any Economic Development groups

Local labor union representatives, specifically law enforcement and fire fighters

Groups that are already advocates for this issue

Iowa Association of School Boards School Administrators of Iowa Iowa State Education Association Urban Education Network Every Child Counts Prevent Child Abuse Iowa Early Care Network Area Education Agencies Iowa Head Start Association Iowa Business Council

DE Contacts on this issue

Judy Jeffrey	515-281-3310	judy.jeffrey@iowa.gov
Lee Tack	515-281-5293	lee.tack@iowa.gov
Pam Pfitzenmaier	515-281-3333	pam.pfitzenmaier@iowa.gov
Lana Michelson	515-281-5735	lana.michelson@iowa.gov
Jeff Berger	515-281-3399	<u>jeff.berger@iowa.gov</u>
Kathi Slaughter	515-281-5651	kathi.slaughter@iowa.gov
LauraBelle Sherman-Proehl	515-242-6018	laurabelle.sherman-proehl@iowa.gov
Dee Gethmann	515-281-5502	dee.gethmann@iowa.gov
Mary Schertz	515-281-5433	mary.Schertz@iowa.gov
Tom Rendon	515-242-6024	tom.rendon@iowa.gov
Penny Milburn	515-727-0656	penny.milburn@iowa.gov